REMARKS

These remarks are submitted in response to the Office Action mailed 7/14/2004.

Applicants appreciatively acknowledge the allowance of claims 19-34. Applicants also acknowledge the indication that claims 6 and 12-17 recite allowable subject matter.

Claims 1-5, 7-11, 18, and 43-45 stand rejected by the Examiner as being anticipated by Splett et al. Splett et al. teach a method of data compression useful for implanted devices that have limited memory capacity. The implanted device of Splett et al. has electrodes implanted at known locations. The electrodes are never moved and so there is no structure for tracking or acquiring location data nor is there any suggestion that location data concerning the electrodes ever be collected.

The Examiner refers to the data samples on waveform 200 in support of the rejection of these claims, but the X_0, X_1, X_2 data points bear no relation to different locations of heart tissue. Instead, data X_0, X_1, X_2 refer to different moments in *time* at which *physiologic data values* are collected.

In contrast, the invention defined by independent claims 1, 3 and 7 recites structure or steps "for obtaining location data." The methods of these claims all incorporate the use of catheters that are equipped so as to be suitable for obtaining location data because catheters are moved about within the patient whereas the implanted electrodes of Splett et al. are stationary.

With further regard to claim 1, data points associate "the physiologic data obtained by each first means at the first moment in time with the location data obtained by the second means at the first moment in time." Any association in memory of physiologic and location data for any other

moment in time is disassociated. However, Splett et al. are only concerned with the implanted electrode's physiologic data capture, and not its location. They never suggest that physiologic data from implanted electrodes be disassociated from memory.

With further regard to claims 3 and 7, an "index value" is provided "in response to a request" that is associated, respectively, with each of the location and physiologic data. The index values permit independent capture of location data to be coordinated with separately captured physiologic data. Critically, however, Splett et al. never obtain location data nor do they associate such data with an index value to achieve a useful methodology, as claimed.

For the foregoing reasons, the teachings of Splett et al. do not anticipate nor render obvious the invention defined by claims 1, 3 and 7.

Reconsideration of the rejected claims is respectfully requested.

If there are any other issues remaining which the Examiner believes need be resolved, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

Dated: January 12, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By _____
David Leason
Registration No.: 36,195
DARBY & DARBY P.C.
P.O. Box 5257
New York, New York 10150-5257
(212) 527-7700
(212) 753-6237 (Fax)
Attorneys/Agents For Applicant